

(g)	1101	Rs. 2,29,669.	
	1102	Rs. 3,06,847.	
	1103	Rs. 1,69,577.	
(h)	1101	Rs. 11,028.	} In round figures.
	1102	Rs. 30,167.	
	1103	Rs. 42,977.	

These figures do not include the transport charges on Government timber.

Irrigation project in Inchakundu.

605. Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—Will the Government be pleased to inform this Council:—

(a) whether the Government have completed their investigations of the Inchakundu Irrigation Project referred to in the speech of the Superintendent of Agriculture and Panchayats in moving for grants for his Department during the Budget Session of 1101 (vide pages 1667 and 1668 of Vol. III of the Cochin Legislative Council Proceedings);

(b) if the answer to (a) is in the affirmative, the results of the investigation;

(c) if the answer is in the negative, at what stage the investigation is at present; and the reasons, if any, for the delay in completing the investigation;

(d) whether the Government are aware that want of proper irrigation facilities in the locality in question is causing great hardship to the paddy cultivators of the place?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) No.

(b) Vide answer to sub-division (a).

(c) The survey work for finding the capacity of the Manapat chira and for raising the bund is over. Spot levels of the probable ayacut have also been taken. Levels are being connected with Inchamudi vally.

The scheme is being investigated in detail by the Special Assistant Engineer for Irrigation. There are no special reasons for the delay.

(d) Yes.

Sale of teak topplings.

606. Mr. Ouseph P. Kundukulam.—(a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether any teak topplings were sold to Messrs. T. Namberumal Chetti and Sons;

(b) what is the measurement of the topplings so sold;

(c) the rate charged for this;

(d) were the topplings sold under the above contract re-measured by the Conservator of Forests;

(e) was there any difference in the measurement made by the Conservator of Forests; and the measurements recorded by the Comptroller of Accounts;

- (f) if so, how the difference arose
(g) has the Government incurred any loss on account of this difference; and if so, who is responsible for the loss?

Mr. K. Govinda Menon.—(a) Yes.

- (b) The cubical contents of the toplings sold are:—

cds. 1513—23—23—4½ and

„ 2091—1—8—7¾.

- (c) Rs. 22 and Rs. 11 a candy respectively.

- (d) Some toplings were remeasured by the Conservator of Forests on the representation of the firm.

- (e) The Comptroller of Accounts does not make or record any measurement of timber.

- (f) and (g). In view of the reply to (e) above no answer is necessary.

607. Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

- (1) whether any teak toplings were sold to Messrs. T. Namberumal Chetti & Sons; what is the measurement of the toplings so sold and what the rate charged for these;

- (2) were the logs, sold under the above contract, remeasured by the Conservator of Forests; if so, what was the difference in the measurement and what was the amount of money reduced on accounts of this difference;

- (3) whether any departmental audit was made regarding this particular contract; and if so, will the Government be pleased to state the result of such audits?

Mr. K. Govinda Menon.—(1) The Member is referred to the answers to sub-divisions (a), (b) and (c) of question No. 606.

- (2) Some toplings were remeasured by the Conservator of Forests on the representation of the firm. The other information required cannot be supplied now.

- (3) No audit was made regarding any special contract.

608. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

- (1) whether any teak toplings were sold to Messrs. T. Namberumal Chetti & Sons; what is the measurement of the toplings so sold and what is the rate charged for these;

- (2) were the logs, sold under the above contract, remeasured by the Conservator; if so, what was the difference in the measurement and what was the amount of money reduced on account of this difference;

- (3) whether any departmental audit was made, regarding this particular contract; and, if so, what was the report of the audit staff?